

**REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action mailed April 8, 2005.

By this Amendment, claim 1 has been amended to more particularly define the present invention. Support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the original claim. Claim 1 is pending in this application.

In view of these amendments, Applicant believes that the pending claim is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Goto et al. (U.S. Patent 6,777,156 B1) as supported by Ando et al. (U.S. Patent 5,912,086). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the cited reference must teach or suggest the invention as a whole, including all the limitations of the claims. Here, in this case, Goto et al. does not teach or suggest the claim elements “(1) vinyl pyrrolidone/vinylacetate copolymers, (2) styrene/maleic acid copolymers, (3) vinylpyrrolidone/dimethylaminoethyl methacrylate copolymers, (4) terpolymers of vinylpyrrolidone/vinylcaprolactam/dimethyl aminoethylmethacrylate, (5) terpenephenolic resin, (6) alkylphenolic resin, (7) polyvinylformal resin, (8) melamine/formaldehyde resin, and (9) polyvinyl acetate.” The Examiner has interpreted the element “pyrogallol acetone resin” in Goto et al. as reading on the “ketone resin” of claim 1. The Examiner notes that Goto et al. teaches that the active hydrogen group-containing compounds can each be used alone or “as a mixture of two or more types” (see column 9, lines 45-47, of Goto et al.). Therefore, in the interest of expediting the allowance of the present application, Applicant has deleted “ketone resin” from claim 1.


Thus, in view of the amendments to claim 1, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are believed to be clearly patentable over the outstanding rejections. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the claims in light of the above remarks is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Dated: May 31, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By   
David T. Nikaido  
Registration No.: 22,663

Lee Cheng  
Registration No.: 40,949

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC.  
1233 20th Street, N.W.  
Suite 501  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 955-3750  
Attorney for Applicant

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 180013 for any such fees; and applicant(s) hereby petition for any needed extension of time.